

Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 IAEA V 05370 01 OF 03 181533Z

47

ACTION SCI-06

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-14 ISO-00 SS-20 NSC-07 AID-20 CEQ-02

CIAE-00 COA-02 COME-00 DODE-00 EB-11 EPA-04 INR-10

L-03 NSF-04 NSAE-00 PM-07 RSC-01 SP-03 INT-08 CG-00

DOT-00 JUSE-00 OMB-01 ACDA-19 FMC-04 H-03 OIC-04

AF-10 ARA-16 EA-11 NEA-14 PRS-01 PA-04 USIA-15 DLOS-07

FEA-02 AGR-20 DRC-01 /280 W
----- 064796

R 181441Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION IAEA VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4556

INFO AEC GERMANTOWN

USMISSION USUN

USMISSION GENEVA

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

AMEMBASSY LONDON

UNCLAS SECTION 1 OF 3 IAEA VIENNA 5370

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PBOR, SENV, IAEA

SUBJECT: IAEA BOARD OF GOVERNORS - OCEAN DUMPING CONVENTIONS

REF: A. IAEA VIENNA 4906 B. STATE 118150

1. SUMMARY: BOARD FAILED TO AUTHORIZE DG TO TRANSMIT
PROPOSED AGENCY DEFINITION AND RECOMMENDATIONS PURSUANT
TO LONDON CONVENTION, PRIMARILY DUE TO OBJECTIONS FROM
THOSE MEMBERS (E.G., CANADA, SWEDEN, AUSTRALIA)
WHICH FELT THAT PROPOSALS DID NOT GO FAR ENOUGH IN
DISCOURAGING OR LIMITING SEA DISPOSAL OF RADIOACTIVE
WASTES. WHEN EFFORTS TO FIND COMPROMISE FORMULATION
WHICH WOULD PERMIT TRANSMITTAL ON SOME INTERIM OR
PROVISIONAL BASIS APPEARED TO BE FOUNDERING, DG
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 IAEA V 05370 01 OF 03 181533Z

TERMINATED DISCUSSION BY OFFERING TO WITHDRAW DOCUMENT

FOR FURTHER REVISION BY SECRETARIAT, WITH ASSISTANCE OF EXPERTS IF REQUIRED, AND RESUBMISSION TO SEPTEMBER BOARD. END SUMMARY.

2. DG INTRODUCED DOCUMENT GOV/1679 BY NOTING THAT DRAFT DEFINITION OF HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE UNSUITABLE FOR DISPOSAL AT SEA, AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING DISPOSAL AT SEA OF OTHER RADIOACTIVE WASTE, WERE BASED ON RESULTS OF AGENCY PANEL WHICH MET IN MARHC 1973 AND ON COMMENTS ON ITS REPORT RECEIVED FROM SEVERAL GOVERNMENTS AND TWO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. NATURE THESE COMMENTS POINTED TO NEED TO REVIEW AND REFINE RECOMMENDATIONS AT EARLY DATE AND CERTAIN COMMENTS OF SUBSTANCE HAD NOT RPT NOT BEEN INCORPORATED BY SECRETARIAT, BUT HAD BEEN HELD FOR FURTHER PANEL TO CONSIDER IN 1975. HE ANTICIPATED SUPPORT FOR THIS PANEL FROM UNEP. IMMEDIATE REQUIREMENT WAS FOR BOARD APPROVAL THIS DOCUMENT AS PROVISIONAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS OF LONDON CONVENTION, TO PROVIDE BASIS FOR FUTURE AGENCY WORK ON SUBJECT, AND TO ASSIST NEXT PANEL WHEN IT MET. WHILE DOCUMENT WAS NOT FINAL WORD, BUT RATHER FIRST APPROACH TO PROBLEM, BOARD MUST RELIZE THAT IF ACTION POSTPONED PENDING ANOTHER PANEL, YEAR DELAY (UNTIL JUNE 1975) WAS MINIMUM THAT WOULD BE EXPECTED, AND IT WOULD NOT RPT NOT BE DESIRABLE IF SUMMER 1974 LOS CONFERENCE SHOULD CONSIDER MATTER, OR LONDON CONVENTION COME INTO FORCE, AND FIND AGENCY LACKING IN EXECUTING TASKS GIVEN IT.

3. DEBATE THEREAFTER BROKE INTO TWO GENERAL PARTS, SPREAD OVER THREE SESSIONS AFTER SEVERAL SUSPENSIONS AND RESUMPTIONS. DURING FIRST PART OF DEBATE, SEVERAL DELS (INCLUDING UK, SWITZERLAND, INDIA, FRG, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, USSR, SOUTH AFRICA) INDICATED THAT THEIR GOVERNMENTS STILL HAD SOME RESERVATIONS OR QUESTIONS AND STRESSED IMPORTANCE OF REVIEW WHICH DG PLANNED FOR 1975, BUT STATED ALSO THAT THEY FELT BOARD COULD APPROVE DOCUMENT AS PROVISIONAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS OF CONVENTION, IN VIEW OF LIKELIHOOD

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 IAEA V 05370 01 OF 03 181533Z

OF UNACCEPTABLE DELAY SHOULD BOARD AWAIT PREPARATION OF MORE FINAL VERSION. SEVERAL OTHER DELS (INCLUDING FRANCE, SWEDEN, AUSTRALIA, CANADA, ITALY, COSTA RICA), WHILE ACCEPTING DESIRABILITY OF TIMELY BOARD ACTION, OBJECTED TO THIS BOARD SESSION AUTHORIZING DG TO TRANSMIT DOCUMENT WITH ANY APPEARANCE OF BOARD APPROVAL; SOME SPOKE AT LENGTH REGARDING SUBSTANTIVE PROBLEMS WHICH THEIR GOVERNMENTS HAD WITH DOCUMENT AS IT STOOD.

MAIN SUBSTANTIVE POINTS OF INTERVENTIONS DURING THIS PART OF
DISCUSSION WERE:

4. SOUTH AFRICA RAISED QUESTIONS REGARDING APPLICABILITY
OF DILUTION MODEL USED BY EXPERTS, AND STATED POSSIBLE
EFFECTS ON MARINE LIFE REQUIRED FURTHER CONSIDERATION
AT LATER DATE.

5. SWITZERLAND STATED THAT TECHNICAL SUBSTANCE OF
DOCUMENT APPEARED SATISFACTORY, THAT ORDERS OF
MAGNITUDE STATED CORRESPONDED TO REQUEST MADE IN
CONVENTION, AND CORRESPONDED TO WHAT COULD BE REQUIRED
IN FACT.

6. CANADA (AMBASSADOR BEESELY, WHO IS ALSO CANADIAN
REP TO LOS CONFERENCE) BEGAN LONG INTERVENTION WITH
STATEMENT OF BASIC CANADIAN POSITION REGARDING OCEAN
DUMPING, I.E., OPPOSITION TO ALL DUMPING OF RADIO-
ACTIVE WASTES AND IN FAVOR OF LAND-BASED SYSTEMS OF
DISPOSAL WHERE MATERIALS COULD BE MONITORED OR RETRIEVED
IF NECESSARY. CANADIAN AUTHORITIES DID NOT RPT NOT
EXPECT TO ISSUE LICENSES FOR SEA DISPOSAL IN FORESEEABLE
FUTURE. HE ADMITTED THAT CANADA COULD TAKE SUCH
ABSOLUTE POSITION BECUASE IT WAS VAST COUNTRY WITH
PLENTY OF ROOM FOR LAND DISPOSAL. IF SEA DUMPING
NEVERTHELESS TO CONTINUE, CANADA FELT IT SHOULD BE

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 IAEA V 05370 02 OF 03 181612Z

47

ACTION SCI-06

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-14 ISO-00 SS-20 NSC-07 AID-20 CEQ-02

CIAE-00 COA-02 COME-00 DODE-00 EB-11 EPA-04 INR-10

L-03 NSF-04 NSAE-00 PM-07 RSC-01 SP-03 INT-08 CG-00

DOTE-00 JUSE-00 OMB-01 ACDA-19 FMC-04 H-03 OIC-04

AF-10 ARA-16 EA-11 NEA-14 PRS-01 PA-04 USIA-15 DLOS-07

FEA-02 AGR-20 DRC-01 /280 W
----- 065166

R 181441Z JUN 74
FM USMISSION IAEA VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4557
INFO AEC GERMANTOWN
USMISSION USUN
USMISSION GENEVA
AMEMBASSY OTTAWA
AMEMBASSY LONDON

UNCLAS SECTION 2 OF 3 VIENNA 5370

SUBJECT TO MOST STRINGENT REGULATION POSSIBLE;
FURTHER STUDY AND DISCUSSION OF PRESENT DRAFT WERE
REQUIRED BEFORE BOARD WOULD HAVE DOCUMENT WHICH GOC
COULD APPROVE IN GOOD CONSCIENCE. STANDARDS SET IN
PRESENT DOCUMENT WERE QTE TOO LIBERAL AND PERMISSIVE
UNQTE, AND HE FELT THAT THERE WAS STILL TIME BEFORE
MATTER BECAME PRESSING. LONDON CONVENTION WAS NOT
RPT NOT ABOUT TO COME INTO FORCE, AND HE COULD ASSURE
BOARD THAT LOS CONFERENCE HAD GREAT DEAL TO DO BEFORE
IT CONSIDERED THIS MATTER; RECORD CLEARLY SHOWED
THAT AGENCY HAD NOT BEEN IDLE AND THIS SUFFICED FOR
PRESENT. HALF LOAF, IN THIS MATTER, WAS CLEARLY NOT
RPT NOT BETTER THAN NONE; CANADA WORRIED THAT IF BOARD
GAVE BLESSING TO ANY PARTIAL OR INCOMPLETE APPROACH
TO PROBLEM, THIS WOULD APPEAR TO SANCTION DUMPING,
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 IAEA V 05370 02 OF 03 181612Z

WHILE CANADA FELT THAT STRICTEST STANDARDS POSSIBLE
WERE ONLY ONES THAT IT COULD ACCEPT. CANADA HAD
FOLLOWING SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON SUBSTANCE OF DOCUMENT,
IN WHICH SHE CONCURRED WITH AUSTRALIA:

A. DOCUMENT SHOULD CONTAIN AGENCY RECOMMENDATION
THAT DUMPING SHOULD PROCEED ONLY RPT ONLY UNDER
INTERNATIONAL OBSERVATION. COMMENT: THIS GOES BEYOND
PROVISIONS OF CONVENTION ITSELF. END COMMENT.

B. RADIATION PROTECTION PHILOSOPHY USED IN
FORMULATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS SHOULD BE STATED, AND
CANADA WOULD LIKE TO SEE ABSOLUTE ICRP PHILOSOPHY
ADOPTED, I.E., THAT ANY RADIATION EXPOSURE WAS
HAZARD WHICH SHOULD NOT RPT NOT BE ACCEPTED WITHOUT
CORRESPONDING BENEFIT.

C. SAFETY PRACTICES REGARDING MATERIAL DUMPED
SHOULD BE MORE CLEARLY STATED; CANADIAN VIEW WAS THAT
WHEN DEALING WITH LOW CONCENTRATIONS OF RADIOACTIVITY,
SAFETY LAY IN RAPID DISPERSION AND DILUTION.

D. DEFINITION OF WHAT CONSTITUTES RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL FOR PURPOSES OF CONVENTION SHOULD BE MORE CAREFULLY SPECIFIED.

E. REGARDING LAYOUT OF DOCUMENT, BACKGROUND AND ADVISORY MATERIAL SHOULD BE CLEARLY KEPT APART FROM DEFINITIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CALLED FOR BY CONVENTION. CANADA FELT THAT ALL OF ABOVE DIFFICULTIES, EXCEPT PERHAPS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL OBSERVATION, COULD BE RESOLVED WITHIN FRAMEWORK OF 1973 PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS, AND FELT THAT, AT MINIMUM, DOCUMENT SHOULD BE DEFERRED AT LEAST UNTIL SEPTEMBER BOARD SESSION TO PERMIT FURTHER CONSIDERATION BY GOVERNMENTAL PANEL WHICH WOULD ALSO INCLUDE SCIENTISTS AND OCEANOGRAPHERS.

7. IN INTERVENTION ALMOST EQUALLY LONG, AUSTRALIA ENDORSED FIVE MAIN SUBSTANTIVE POINTS MADE BY CANADA (A-E ABOVE). AUSTRALIA FELT THAT DISCUSSION WAS UNDERLAIN UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 IAEA V 05370 02 OF 03 181612Z

BY SUBSTANTIVE DISAGREEMENT OVER ADEQUACY OF RECOMMENDATIONS IN DOCUMENT, BUT FELT ALSO THAT PRESENT DOCUMENT COULD BE MADE ACCEPTABLE INTERIM MEASURE WITHOUT INTRODUCTION OF NEW TECHNICAL MATERIAL IF REWRITTEN BY SECRETARIAT BASED ON CONCEPTS AND MODELS USED BY 1973 PANEL, WITH ASSISTANCE OF EXPERTS IF REQUIRED, FOR RESUBMISSION TO SEPTEMBER BOARD, OR AT LATEST FEBRUARY 1975 BOARD SESSION. IF SECRETARIAT ELECTED THIS OPTION, AUSTRALIA WAS PREPARED TO MAKE AVAILABLE SENIOR EXPERT, WHO CHAIRED 1973 PANEL, TO ASSIST.

8. SWEDEN EXPLAINED THAT NATIONAL LAW PROHIBITED DUMPING WITHIN SWEDISH TERRITORIAL WATERS, OR FROM SWEDISH SHIPS ON HIGH SEAS. SWEDEN HAD URGED THAT OTHERS FOLLOW SAME COURSE IN OTHER INTERNATIONAL BODIES, AND HERE, SWEDEN URGED CONSERVATIVE APPROACH, POSSIBLY EXTENDING TO LOWERING LIMITS CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT BY ONE ORDER OF MAGNITUDE. HE NOTED THAT LONG-TERM EFFECTS OF DUMPING WERE NOT YET WELL-KNOWN, AND ALSO THAT DUMPING WAS IRREVERSIBLE METHOD OF DISPOSAL. ACCORDINGLY, IF MAGNITUDE OF CURRENT ACTIVITY LIMITS WERE MAINTAINED, THERE WAS NEED TO DEFINE LOWER QUANTITY LIMITS FOR INDIVIDUAL DUMPS AND PROCEDURE FOR "INTERNATIONAL CONTROL" OF PERMITS PURSUANT TO CONVENTION; IF ACTIVITY LIMITS WERE LOW ENOUGH, HOWEVER, THERE WOULD BE NO NEED FOR NEW LOWER QUANTITY LIMITS FOR INDIVIDUAL DUMPS. FINALLY, SWEDEN FELT THAT RADIATION PROTECTION VIEWS IMPLICIT

IN DOCUMENT APPLIED ONLY TO NORTHEAST ATLANTIC; THIS
RAISED QUESTIONS REGARDING VALIDITY OF ASSUMPTIONS AND
SAFETY FACTORS IN REPORT. HE CALLED FOR BOARD TO
MAINTAIN RESTRICTIVE ATTITUDE IN ORDER TO MINIMIZE
DUMPING, FELT THAT THERE WAS GENERAL AGREEMENT IN
FAVOR OF MORE CONSERVATIVE APPROACH, AND WHILE HE
UNDERSTOOD SECRETARIAT RELUCTANCE TO START MATTERS
AGAIN FROM BEGINNING, FELT THAT PRESENT DOCUMENT COULD
BE USED AS WORKING PAPER FOR FURTHER WORK BY EXPERTS
AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND AS BASIS FOR REVIEW OF
MATTER.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 IAEA V 05370 02 OF 03 181612Z

9. DURING ABOVE DISCUSSION, DG INTERVENED TO EXPRESS
SERIOUS RESERVATIONS ABOUT SECRETARIAT UNDERTAKING TO
REDRAFT DOCUMENT, WITH OR WITHOUT EXPERT ASSISTANCE,
FOR SEPTEMBER BOARD ON GROUNDS THAT DIVERGENT VIEWS
COULD BE NO MORE EASILY HARMONIZED IN SUCH REDRAFT
THAN HAD BEEN ACCOMPLISHED TO DATE. HOWEVER, DISCUSSION
THEN BEGAN TO DEVOLVE INTO PROCEDURAL MUDDLE.
AUSTRALIA AND CANADA PROPOSED REDRAFTED LANGUAGE FOR
PARA 4(B) OF RECOMMENDED BOARD ACTION CONTAINED IN
DOCUMENT, AND PARTIES TO DISCUSSION BEGAN TO SEEK
MEANS OF A) AUTHORIZING DG TO TRANSMIT DOCUMENT TO UK,

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 IAEA V 05370 03 OF 03 181601Z

47

ACTION SCI-06

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-14 ISO-00 SS-20 NSC-07 AID-20 CEQ-02

CIAE-00 COA-02 COME-00 DODE-00 EB-11 EPA-04 INR-10

L-03 NSF-04 NSAE-00 PM-07 RSC-01 SP-03 INT-08 CG-00

DOTE-00 JUSE-00 OMB-01 ACDA-19 FMC-04 H-03 OIC-04

AF-10 ARA-16 EA-11 NEA-14 PRS-01 PA-04 USIA-15 DLOS-07

FEA-02 AGR-20 DRC-01 /280 W

----- 065059

R 181441Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION IAEA VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4558

INFO AEC GERMANTOWN

USMISSION USUN

USMISSION GENEVA

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

AMEMBASSY LONDON

UNCLAS SECTION 3 OF 3 IAEA VIENNA 5370

AS DEPOSITARY FOR LONDON CONVENTION, AS MEANS OF
DEMONSTRATING DEGREE TO WHICH AGENCY WORK HAD PROGRESSED
WHILE (B) MAKING IT CLEAR THAT BOARD WAS NOT IN ANY WAY
FORMALLY APPROVING IT, EVEN ON INTERIM OR PROVISIONAL
BASIS OR SUBJECT TO REVIEW, AND THAT SEVERAL BOARD
MEMBERS CONTINUED TO HAVE SERIOUS RESERVATIONS ABOUT
CONTENT. MAIN HANGUP IN THIS DISCUSSION WAS INSISTENCE
BY SOME (E.G., FRG) ON ONE HAND THAT BOARD SHOULD NOT
AUTHORIZE TRANSMITTAL OF DOCUMENT WITH ANY INDICATION
THAT IT WAS INCOMPLETE OR INADEQUATE, AGAINST INSISTENCE
BY OTHERS (E.G., AUSTRALIA, CANADA) THAT TRANSMITTAL
NOT RPT NOT IMPLY ANY BOARD APPROVAL ON POINTS WHICH
THEY QUESTIONED. EFFORTS OVER LUNCH BREAK TO FIND
LANGUAGE ACCEPTABLE TO ALL HANDS FAILED. IN END, DG
TERMINATED DISCUSSION BY VOLUNTEERING TO DO WHAT HE
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 IAEA V 05370 03 OF 03 181601Z

HAD EARLIER RESISTED, I.E., IT WITHDRAW DOCUMENT FROM
BOARD IN ORDER TO REDRAFT IT, WITH ASSISTANCE OF
EXPERTS IF AND AS NECESSARY, AND RESUBMIT IT TO
BOARD IN SEPTEMBER.

10. COMMENT: MISSION FEELS THAT ABOVE DISCUSSION
REPRESENTED POOR PRACTICE FOR NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS.
AS DEPT. AWARE, DG HAS INVITED COMMENT ON THIS MATTER
FROM MEMBER STATES TWICE SINCE 1973 PANEL MET AND
REPORTED; DOCUMENT WAS PRESENTED TO BOARD ONLY WITH
UNDERSTANDING THAT CERTAIN REMAINING QUESTIONS OF
SUBSTANCE RAISED BY US, AMONG OTHERS, WOULD BE SUB-
MITTED TO FURTHER PANEL EARLY IN 1975 FOR RESOLUTION.
FORCEFUL OPPOSITION TO BOARD APPROVAL OF THIS
DOCUMENT AT THIS SESSION WAS FIRST THAT ANYONE HAD
HEARD FROM GOVERNMENTS OF AUSTRALIA AND CANADA IN
WAY OF COMMENT ON DRAFT PAPER. IN ADDITION, MISSION
UNDERSTANDS THAT JAPAN FINALLY SUBMITTED COMMENTS
ON DRAFT PAPER ON DAY FOLLOWING BOARD MEETING. MISSION

IS FORCED TO AGREE THAT ABOVE DISCUSSION ABOUT WHETHER
AND HOW BOARD COULD AGREE TO AUTHORIZE DG TO TRANSMIT
PAPER, ON ANY BASIS AT ALL, TO UK AS DEPOSITORY FOR
LONDON CONVENTION WAS BASED ON A GOOD MANY SUBSTANTIVE
DIFFERENCES REGARDING CONTENT OF PAPER ITSELF,
DIFFERENCES WHICH IT MAY WELL TAKE MORE THAN SECRETARIAT
REDRAFT TO RESOLVE, ALSO, IF REDRAFTING EXERCISE IS
BEGUN, IT MAY RAISE AGAIN QUESTIONS RELATED TO
PREVIOUS SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS FROM US, SWEDEN AND
SOME OTHERS WHICH HAD BEEN DEFERRED IN ORDER TO SUBMIT
THIS PAPER TO THIS SESSION OF BOARD. MISSION WILL
REPORT FURTHER AS WE LEARN OF SECRETARIAT PLANS AND
INTENTIONS FOR REDRAFTING OF PAPER, BUT IN ANY EVENT,
MISSION FEELING IS THAT, UNFORTUNATELY, PROSPECTS FOR
SUCCESSFUL TERMINATION OF THIS PART OF THE EXERCISE BY
SEPTEMBER BOARD SESSION DO NOT, IN LIGHT OF RECORD OF
THIS DISCUSSION, LOOK VERY BRIGHT. END COMMENT.PORTER

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: WATER POLLUTION, ECOLOGY, WASTE DISPOSAL, AGREEMENT DRAFT, RADIOACTIVE WASTES DISPOSAL
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 18 JUN 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974IAEAV05370
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740158-0859
From: IAEA VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740636/aaaabfbj.tel
Line Count: 402
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SCI
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 8
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. IAEA VIENNA 4906 B. STATE 118150
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: smithrj
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 17 SEP 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <17 SEP 2002 by PhilliR0>; APPROVED <10 JAN 2003 by smithrj>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: IAEA BOARD OF GOVERNORS - OCEAN DUMPING CONVENTIONS
TAGS: PBOR, SENV, IAEA
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005